

Revisiting the "Monasticism" of the *Community Rule*:
Sociological and Scriptural Models for the Common Life of the Yahad

Yonder M. Gillihan
Boston College

November 24, 2008

Introduction

Since the earliest studies of the DSS, the term "monasticism" has been applied to the *yahad*, the segment of the sect of the Covenanters that was governed by the *Community Rule*. E. F. Sutcliffe called the *yahad* "the monks of Qumran" in an influential book published in 1960. More recently, in 2001, Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel defended the identification of Qumran as an Essene monastery.¹

Matthias Klinghardt has challenged the monastic model of the *yahad* by bringing comparative materials from the Greco-Roman world. He agrees with earlier scholars, such as Hans Bardtke and Carl Schneider in the 1960s, Martin Hengel in the 1970s, and Moshe Weinfeld in the 1980s, that the *yahad* should be classified as a Jewish version of the "voluntary associations," such as cultic societies, recreational clubs, ethnic associations, associations of merchants, and so forth, that proliferated around the Mediterranean world in the Greco-Roman period. Klinghardt draws from this classification a bold inference: because among the voluntary associations we find no evidence of cenobitic monasticism until the rise of Christian groups in Egypt and Syria in the 4th century CE, it is historically implausible to believe that the *yahad* was a monastic community. Instead, he argues, it must have been a synagogue. The *yahad* met only

occasionally; its members were not celibate, and Qumran was most certainly not their monastery.

Klinghardt's revisionist argument is worth considering. First, his use of comparative materials from the Greco-Roman world is good method; second, his classification of the *yahad* as a voluntary association invites us to utilize models of associational formation and activity drawn from the modern social sciences to better understand the group. Third, his attention to the problems of bringing broad labels such as "monasticism" to the study of the *yahad* should encourage us to consider the process of classification carefully, and to be as precise as possible when defining the subjects of our inquiries.

What is monasticism?

Let us first consider the nature of the "monasticism" model that Klinghardt rejects. The most striking feature is "cenobitic life," by which he means living under one roof day and night.² In a more fully articulated version of the cenobitic model (which is, of course, not the only form of monasticism), monks are permanently celibate males who retreat to a monastery in order to devote themselves to an ascetic regimen of spiritual discipline. Life at the monastery is regulated by a head figure, such as an abbot. Monks work together, eat together, share all property, and participate in a common cult.

Is this model appropriate? Were the members of the *yahad* "monks," and was Qumran their "monastery," as has been argued and assumed now for decades?

I agree with Klinghardt and his predecessors that the *yahad* was a Jewish voluntary association, and that its flourishing was part of the phenomenon of a general proliferation of associations in the Hellenistic-Roman era. But Klinghardt makes a methodological error when he infers that one classification, the Greco-Roman voluntary

association, automatically precludes another, monasticism. His error stems from the assumption, which Klinghardt shares with others, about how voluntary associations formed in antiquity. Associations did not develop their organization and rules through the "influence" of one association upon another. While the statutes of ancient associations share an impressive list of organizational and regulatory features, each association also developed peculiar features. The peculiar features of each association resulted primarily from its relationship with local cults, patrons, and above all the political organization of its local *polis* or territory. Modern sociological models of associational formation predict that associations will draw upon the organization, protocol, and law in the various spheres of the state.³ Associations drew upon the organizational patterns and regulatory practices of public institutions, from governing councils and courts, to the public cults and the military. The features of voluntary associations could so strongly resemble those of the state that it has become commonplace to speak about the associations as "miniature republics."⁴

In what follows I argue that the primary purposes of the *yaḥad* help us understand which institutions of the ancient Judean commonwealth most strongly influenced the sect's development of its peculiar features. In short, the *yaḥad* aimed to procure atonement for the righteous remnant within apostate Israel, and to prepare the wicked for destruction in an eschatological war. Procuring atonement and preparing for warfare gave rise to a way of life that reflected the activity and regulations of the temple cult and of the military. Striking features of this way of life included sharing communal property, taking meals together, convening for communal liturgy and councils, living in close proximity, and voluntarily assuming the discipline of sexual abstinence. I conclude that the features

of the *yahad* are sufficiently analogous to later forms of "monasticism" to justify *comparison*, but also different enough to prevent *identification* of the *yahad* as a group of "monks" living in the "monastery" of Qumran.

The way of life among the *yahad*: evidence and inferences

We begin by reviewing what we can state with confidence about the *yahad*'s way of life. Several features are spelled out directly in the *Community Rule*. A statement of purpose in 1QS 6:1-3 explicitly describes members' communal activities: "together shall they eat, and together shall they bless, and together shall they deliberate." The same statement requires members to follow the statutes of the *yahad* *בבכול מגורייהם*, "in all their dwellings." This reference to multiple dwellings, or "sojourns," indicates that the activity of the *yahad* occurred in a variety of settings, and not only in a single centralized place. Indeed, the statement of purpose indicates that the *yahad*'s eating, praying, and deliberating together, must occur wherever members find themselves, whether in groups of fewer than ten,⁵ groups of ten or more, or plenary assemblies of all members. Another statute requires the *yahad* to meet together in a *מושב הרבים*, "assembly of the Many," for one third of every night of the year (1QS 6:7-8). Sessions are devoted to reading Scripture, studying judgment, and prayer or other liturgical activity. The nightly sessions of the Many appear to be where the main work of the *yahad* took place. While plenary assemblies occurred nightly, it is clear that the work of the *yahad* could be carried out in a variety of settings: it did not require members to live day and night under one roof.

Several other passages indicate that the *yahad* collected members' property into a communal pool, out of which members received what they needed for sustenance (1QS

5:2; statutes on initiation and property in 6:13-23). Again, sharing property requires living in close proximity, but not living under one roof.

From these statutes we may conclude that members of the *yahad* lived in quite close proximity. They held property in common and regularly shared meals, the food for which was provided from the store of communal property.⁶ The *yahad* met nightly to study, deliberate, and worship. But the most we can say about their life together was that their "neighborhood" was a tightly knit enclave that was almost certainly related, in some way, to the industrial complex of Qumran.⁷ The statutes of the *Community Rule* do not support the claim that the *yahad* permanently resided in a single compound, campus, or building.

Other "monastic" elements of the *yahad*'s way of life must be inferred. The most important of these is celibacy. Early in the study of the DSS, the *yahad* was identified with the Essenes. All ancient descriptions of the Essenes-- most notably, Philo, Josephus, and the elder Pliny-- describe them as celibate males; Josephus notes that there is a second branch of Essenes that marry and have children. More recently, Joseph Baumgarten has argued that celibacy is evident in a statement in column 7 the *Damascus Rule*, which distinguishes between a majority of members of the sect, who marry and have children, and a special group called the "perfect of the way," which is guaranteed life for a thousand generations. Baumgarten argues that this blessing is compensation for the hardship of celibacy that the "perfect of the way" take upon themselves.⁸ Further, the *Community Rule* is different from the other Rule scrolls-- CD and 1QSa-- in that it lacks any mention whatever of family life, women, or children. So we have an argument from silence in the *Community Rule*, a plausible interpretation of the "perfect of the way" in

the *Damascus Rule*, and the Essene Hypothesis. But we do not have a straightforward statement anywhere in the *Community Rule* indicating that the *yaḥad* comprised celibate members.

Two purposes of the *yaḥad*: atonement and judgment

When we examine the major purposes of the *yaḥad*, the issue of celibacy becomes a bit clearer. The *yaḥad* had two major purposes: to procure atonement for the righteous remnant within apostate Israel, and to judge wickedness, both within their own ranks and, more importantly, within the apostate majority of Jews outside the sect.

Each purpose serves the immediate needs of the community: atonement presents the righteous remnant as purified and holy before God; judgment draws a boundary between insiders and outsiders, and motivates insiders to adhere to sectarian law. Each purpose also has an eschatological corollary: atonement prepares the righteous for vindication at the End of Days, when the "dominion of Belial" comes to an end and God restores Israel. Judgment, on the other hand, prepares the wicked for destruction at the End of Days. The sect imagined that their enemies would be destroyed once and for all in the eschatological war described in the *War Rule* as the "Day of Vengeance" (1QM 7:5) and "time of vengeance" (1QM 15:6). The *Community Rule* also names the "Day of Vengeance" as a time for which the *yaḥad* must prepare.⁹

The purposes of atonement and judgment are directly related to major branches of the Judean state: procuring atonement is related to the temple cult, and preparing for the Day of Vengeance is related to the military. The *yaḥad* developed its organizational structure and regulations on the basis of these state institutions, both as it encountered

them in the ancient Judean context, and as it idealized them on the basis of its scriptural interpretation. As a result of its cultic and military purposes, the *yaḥad* developed features that other contemporary voluntary associations lacked, such as the requirement for sexual abstinence among members, spatial separation from outsiders, a relatively centralized living arrangement, and the practice of sharing food and property.

Atonement for the righteous

We now turn to the evidence for the purposes of the *yaḥad*. The first is the task of procuring atonement.¹⁰ This task appears in the statement of purpose preceding the statutes governing the *yaḥad*: any man who joins the *yaḥad* takes upon himself its discipline in order

... *to atone* for all who freely offer themselves, to be holiness in Aaron and a house of truth in Israel ... (1QS 5:6, my translation)

A later passage in the *Community Rule* explains more precisely how the *yaḥad* procures atonement: through "works of judgment and the distress of purification" they offer propitiation for guilt (1QS 8:3-4). Most important is the statement in 9:4-5: the *yaḥad* is established

to atone for the guilt of iniquity and for the infidelity of sin, and to be a cause of divine favor upon the land, more than the flesh of holocausts and the slaughtered victims of sacrifice. For the dedication of the lips for judgments is like the fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of the way is like the dedication of a pleasing offering.

Atonement and sexual abstinence in Biblical law

The fact that the *yaḥad* performed acts of atonement required that they keep themselves undefiled from all impurities, just as temple priests were required to do. In biblical law, priests and worshippers who have contracted impurities are prohibited from

approaching the holy grounds and consecrated items (Lev 22:1-6). Since some of the commonest forms of impurity come from sexual activity and cycles, i.e., menstruation and childbirth (Lev 12:1-8), and seminal emission (Lev 22:4; cp.15:1-33), sexual abstinence *while tending to cultic duties* offers the most certain guard against impurities.

It must be stressed that priestly sexual abstinence in Leviticus is neither permanent celibacy, nor ascetic in the sense that its purpose is to discipline the individual's physical appetite and elevate his spiritual state. Instead, temporary sexual abstinence serves the practical purpose of safeguarding Israel's holy cult against the common impurities generated in the course of normal married life. When priests are not administering the cult, they resume normal conjugal pleasures of married life. After all, unless a *cohen* makes babies, there will be no future *cohanim*.

Given the *yaḥad's* cultic purpose, we may confidently infer that sexual abstinence was required of members. But sexual abstinence should be regarded as a *temporary* measure taken to ensure that the *yaḥad's* cult of atonement was not defiled by impurities. It remains eminently plausible that members of the *yaḥad* remained sexually abstinent from the time that they joined until death. After all, the *yaḥad's* cultic work had to be sustained throughout the "reign of Belial," which never, in fact, ended.¹¹ (We're still in it, by the sect's definition.) But permanent, ascetic celibacy seems not to have been an ideal.

Atonement and the priestly practice of eating together

An important analogy to the Covenanters' practice of taking food from a common store and eating it together comes in the custom throughout the Greco-Roman world: priests of the public cults shared meals while they administered their cultic duties.¹² The *yaḥad* was most likely influenced by the laws governing the Jewish public cult, such as

the laws on priestly commensality in Leviticus. According to Lev 6:25-7:6, sacrificial victims that the people of Israel bring to the Tabernacle for sin and guilt offerings are "most holy" (קֹדֶשׁ קֹדְשִׁים) and must be eaten by the officiating priests in the court of the tabernacle (6:29). These offerings are different from the regular food that the priests and Levites obtain through people's sacrifices and tithes: they can only be eaten "in the holy place" (בַּמִּקְוֶה קֹדֶשׁ, 6:26; 7:6; cp. Ezek 42:13) by the priests as they wear their holy vestments.

Thus in the scriptural laws governing the temple cult, we find the likely sources for at least two features of their common life: temporary sexual abstinence, and common meals. We may also infer that the scriptural and halakic laws aimed at maintaining purity around the cult of atonement inspired the *yaḥad* to develop a lifestyle that required relatively centralized living, spatially separated from outsiders.

Judgment and the day of vengeance

We now consider the second purpose of the *yaḥad*, which appears appears in two forms. The first, condemnation of the wicked, appears alongside every mention of atonement: 1QS 5:7 states that the work of the *yaḥad* will "condemn all those who transgress the statute." A similar passage in 1QS 8 affirms that the *yaḥad* comprises "men elected by divine pleasure, in order to atone for the land *and to repay the wicked their retribution*" (8:6-7); and the *yaḥad* exists "in order to atone for the land, *and to determine judgment for wickedness*" (8:10). Together, atonement and condemnation fulfill the purpose of God's covenant with Israel: to bless those who obey, and to curse those who transgress.

In the *yahad's* ideology, the eschatological corollary of judgment is warfare: when God visits retribution upon the land, the righteous will see vindication, while the wicked will meet divine vengeance. The wicked meet their fate on the "day of vengeance." The *Maskil*, apparently the highest official within the *yahad*, is required to be עתי ליום נקם, "prepared for the Day of Vengeance" (1QS 9:23), and to abstain from conflict with outsiders until that Day (10:19). All of the *Maskil's* work focuses on leading and teaching the men of the *yahad* what they must do (10:12-21a). His preparation for battle suggests that the men of the *yahad* were also being prepared for the same purpose.

Warfare and sexual abstinence in biblical law

We should, then, recognize that the *yahad* prepared for war against the wicked.

We should expect their common life to reflect military ideals. Scriptural laws treat warfare as a holy affair, subject to safeguards against impurity similar to those that protect the temple cult. The laws of the war camp in Deut 23 require that Israelite soldiers be sexually abstinent while on campaign: any man who has a seminal emission must leave the camp and purify himself until sunset (23:10-11). This law appears in the laws of the war camp in 1QM 7:5-6, alongside an explicit prohibition of women (and young boys) from entering the camp to join the men, from when the soldiers "leave Jerusalem to go to battle, until they return" (1QM 7:3-4).

Both Deuteronomy and the *War Rule* prescribe temporary sexual abstinence to protect the holiness of the war camp during a campaign. Permanent celibacy is neither idealized nor mentioned: to the contrary, it seems assumed in the *War Rule* that the Sons of Light will resume normal sexual relations when they return from their campaign against the Sons of Darkness.

Josephus on the Essenes: an application of Deuteronomy 23 to Essene life

Josephus' description of the Essenes also suggests that their ideology and practice included militaristic elements. He writes that a new Essene initiate is given a trowel or hatchet (*BJ* 2.137). He uses this tool to dig a hole when he defecates, and then to bury his excrement "in order not to offend the rays of God" (2.148-49). This practice perfectly follows the Deuteronomistic laws of the war camp: soldiers must carry a trowel with them as part of their equipment, so that when they relieve themselves in a designated area outside the camp they can "dig a hole and cover up [their] excrement" (Deut 23:13). The warrant for this biblical law matches that of the Essenes' law, and probably forms its basis: "Because YHWH your God travels along with your camp . . . therefore your camp must be holy, so that he may not see anything indecent among you and turn away from you" (Deut 23:14). That the Essenes' practice, as Josephus describes it, was shaped by militaristic influences, is obvious. If we accept the identification of the Essenes with the Covenanters' sect, and in particular with the *yaḥad*, then we find in Josephus' account another example of the application of the Deuteronomistic law of the war camp to sectarian life.

Other sources of "influence" for the *yaḥad*'s common life

The common life of the *yaḥad* has important analogies not only in biblical law, but also in ancient military life. In Jewish, Greek, and Roman military encampments we find all-male communities that were spatially separate from the rest of the population, ideally celibate, subject to rigorous discipline and a system of authority, and "communitarian" in their property, meals, and daily cultic practices.

Common soldiers in the Greek and Roman armies took their meals together and shared supplies from a common store.¹³ Each soldier was responsible for purchasing and preparing his own rations, but all food came out of a common supply that travelled with the campaigning army. Clothing was provided at public expense, at least in the Roman legions.¹⁴

Xenophon's description of the Spartan king on military campaign bears striking analogies to the description of common life among the *yaḥad*.¹⁵ The king takes all meals with the commanders of his regiments (πολέμαρχοι). Three other officials attend to their needs – presumably including preparation of food – so that the war council can carry out its deliberations (κοινοβουλῶσιν) without distraction.¹⁶ Further, at the start of each campaign and then each morning while in the field, the king assembles before dawn with all his regimental commanders, along with any officers who wish to attend, and offers sacrifices to Zeus and Athena. After the sacrifices the king assembles the entire army and begins issuing orders for the day.¹⁷ Thus the Spartan king and his council eat, deliberate, and worship communally – and do so daily. The daily combination of these communal activities sets both the Spartan war council and the Council of the *yaḥad* apart from the communal activity of voluntary associations, which took place far less frequently-- usually once per month.

Conclusion

We have considered two purposes of the *yaḥad* and the implications that carrying out a cult of atonement and preparing for a military campaign would have for the association's lifestyle. Several aspects of the *yaḥad*'s lifestyle seem at first to fit the traditional model: they were sexually abstinent men, spatially separated from the rest of

Israel, carrying out cultic activities, following a regimented way of life under the guidance of officers. While Klinghardt's assumptions about how the features of the *yaḥad* formed are off the mark, we nevertheless may agree with him that there are good reasons to refrain from applying the term "monastic" to the *yaḥad*. The *yaḥad* did not necessarily comprise members living together under one roof, but consisted instead of a neighborhood of multiple "dwellings." The *yaḥad*'s sexual norm was temporary sexual abstinence as a safeguard against impurity, and not permanent ascetic celibacy for the purpose of elevating members' spiritual status.

Nevertheless there may be much to be gained from comparative analysis of later Christian monastic life, and the way of life among the *yaḥad*. Understanding how one rather demanding, peculiar way of life developed in its socio-political setting may shed light on how another, similar way of life developed in its own context. The discovery of one set of influences for one association may prompt us to search for similar influences for another association. It would be interesting to investigate, for example, how the organization of the White Monastery under Pachomius in fourth-century Egypt related to local public cults, cities, and the military. We may ultimately discover that entirely different sets of socio-political circumstances and ideology motivated the formation of groups with superficially similar characteristics. One prime utility of broad categories is that they facilitate the kinds of comparative analysis that reveals the distinctiveness of each unit.

¹ See Edmund F. Sutcliffe, *The Monks of Qumran* (Westminster: Newman, 1960); Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel, "Was Qumran Indeed a Monastery? The Consensus and Its Challengers: An Archaeologist's View," in Broshi, ed., *Bread, Wine, Walls and Scrolls* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 259-73.

² Klinghardt, "Manual of Discipline," 269; also pp. 251-52, 260-61.

³ Hegel (*Philosophy of Right*) and Weber (*Economy and Society*), as well as Aristotle (*Politics*), predict that within a rationalized society, organizational and regulatory patterns of the state will be virtually identical to the organization and regulatory habits of voluntary associations. This phenomenon is attributable to several related factors. First, by publicizing the details of state organization and law, the state provides a ubiquitous and persistent template of social organization that subjects encounter, negotiate, and expect at every turn. Due to subjects' familiarity with them, state patterns of organization and regulation are convenient to appropriate and adapt into patterns of associational organization and regulation. Additionally, adaptation of state patterns allows private organizations to engage the state efficiently and thereby procure benefits that advance associational interests. Other factors contribute to associational adaptation of state patterns: associations may form when members of a branch of the state-- the police or military, for example-- develop interests in recreation or advocacy. Associations formed by members of a police or military unit will likely reflect the features of the state unit within which members met. Associations may be formed or sponsored by state initiative, such as patriotic clubs, or associations that receive funds from "faith-based initiatives." Origination from within the state, and ongoing contact with the state, contributes to the assimilation of state features within associational life.

⁴ Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 31, further states: "However small, a club must have officers, with titles the grander the better, often imitating the titles of municipal officials." Ramsay MacMullen concurs: "At least the larger craft associations constituted in every detail miniature cities" (*Roman Social Relations*, 76). For general discussion of the *collegia* see MacMullen, 71-87; Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*, 311-36. In his study of associations in Roman Ostia, Russell Meiggs observes that the membership of a *collegium* was typically called the *plebs collegii*; like the *plebs* of a town, members were governed by a codified *lex*. Within these "miniature republics" any dedicated member could become a "president" or *quinquennalis*, a *quaestor* or *curator* (Meiggs, 314). Further see R. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven: Yale, 1984) 31-47.

⁵ The more specific instructions that follow aid our understanding of the first three lines: in groups of ten or more a priest must be present (6:3b-4b); this seems to imply that where fewer than ten elites gathered no priest was needed, but the hierarchy of rank and the requirement to carry on the *yahad's* activity still obtained. Whether or not this inference is accepted, it is clear that the *yahad's* activity primarily occurred within groups of ten or more members.

⁶ If a common food supply was not a feature of the life within the *yahad*, it is hard to make sense of the penalty for lying about property: the offender is excluded from the "purity" of the Many for one year, וַנַּעַנְשׁוּ אֹתוֹ רְבִיעִית לַחֲמוֹ, "and they shall fine him one fourth of his food" (1QS 7:24-25). The simplest explanation of this statute is that it assumes that members received their לחם, "bread" or "food," in the form of a ration from the communal property. Josephus' description of the Essenes in *BJ* 2.129-32 explicitly states that they shared not one but two meals each day: one following morning toil and another in the evening, after their afternoon labor. All ate the same simple fare: a single loaf of bread and one serving of another food. The items were prepared by a "baker" (στυποποιός) and a "cook" (μάγειρος), who, it must be assumed, had charge of a common pantry. Although the meals cannot be called "sacral" in the sense that they commemorated special occasions like festivals or even Sabbaths, Josephus affirms that they were solemn affairs for which members prepared themselves by ritually bathing and donning white garments. A priest said a blessing before and after the meal. Josephus' description comports well with the aims of the *yahad* as they are portrayed in the *Community Rule*: to maintain continually the same degree of purity and holiness within the community as was required in the Jerusalem temple. Only by vigilantly protecting communal purity and holiness could the *yahad* perform its mission to form a substitute cult by which to procure atonement.

⁷ As the archeological evidence from Qumran and its environs suggests, members of the *yahad* could have lived as neighbors in tents, caves, and buildings in the Qumran settlement. Centralization of living quarters provided an effective barrier against impurity, since it allowed members of the *yahad* to regulate contact with outsiders quite strictly. I do not find it necessary to conclude that the settlement at Qumran housed all members of the *yahad*. While it may have been where members worked to bring in the revenue that supported the sect, where sessions of the Many assembled, and where some communal meals were taken, it was probably not a "monastery" but a plantation. See esp. the recent analysis by Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004).

⁸ The description of two segments of the sect in CD 7 offers plausible grounds for inferring that they *yahad* comprised celibate men. The passage states that, on the one hand, there are the men of perfect holiness; on the other hand there are the commoners that "dwell in camps according to the Rule (סדר) of the land, take wives, and beget children" (CD 7:6-7). We may infer that the men of perfect holiness did not dwell in camps, take wives and beget children. In other words, they lived in a more centralized location and practiced celibacy. The *Damascus Rule* seems to imply that God compensates for the perfectionists' lack of progeny by granting them life "for thousands of generations" (CD 7:6 || CD 19:20). For discussion see J. Baumgarten, "Celibacy," *EDSS* 1.122-24 and idem, "Qumran-Essene Restraints on Marriage," *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. L. Schiffman (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990) 3-24.

A similar promise is given to the "penitents of the desert (שבֵי מדבר) who shall live for a thousand generations" in a *peshet* on the Psalter (4QPs^a 3:1-2). The *peshet* thus locates the elite Covenanters, which it labels the "Council of the *yahad*" (עצת היחד), in the wilderness, not in camps throughout the land. While the *peshet* goes on to say that "to them will be all the inheritance of Adam, and to their seed forever," the reference to "seed" has both figurative and eschatological meanings. Prior to the eschaton, while the "penitents" live celibately, their "seed" must be taken figuratively. In the eschaton, however, when the restored Jerusalem temple replaces the "temple of man," then presumably the penitents may resume marrying and producing offspring. All commentators take the phrase "penitents of the desert" or "returnees to the desert" as a reference to the elite segment of the Covenanters that lived in the Judean desert at Qumran. For discussion and bibliography see M. Horgan, *Pesharim* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979) 213-14. Compare IQS 4:6-8: "to the sons of truth . . . shall be healing, great peace in a long life, and fruitfulness of seed along with everlasting blessing and eternal joy in life without end . . ." For additional discussion see J. Baumgarten, "Qumran-Essene Restraints," 17-19.

⁹ See IQS 9:23; 10:9; cp. IQS 3:18; 4:18-19, 25, "time of punishment."

¹⁰ Many scholars argue that members of the *yahad* intended to create a holy community that would function not only as a cult of atonement, but as the temple itself. The argument is plausible but not necessary; I prefer to argue more cautiously.

The evidence for the *yahad*-as-temple position comes from an interpretation of 4QFlorilegium describes an eternal temple that YHWH himself will build at the end of days. This temple will never be defiled by impure Israelites nor ravaged by foreigners, כי אין קדושו שם, "because his holiness is there" (4Q174 fr. 1 1:4). This eternal temple appears to be a physical building: it will be built at the end of days by royal and priestly messianic figures, the "branch of David" and the "Interpreter of the Law" (4Q174 fr. 1 1:10-13). This eschatological temple stands in contrast to the former temple, which had been laid waste by foreigners as a result of Israel's sins (4Q174 fr. 1 1:5-6). The Florilegium states that God commanded a temple, which the text designates as מקדש אדם, "temple of man" or "temple of Adam," to be built; there is much debate over what the identity of this temple. According to Devorah Dimant, the "temple of man" is a temple composed of human beings, i.e., the *yahad*, in the period between the desecration of the first temple and the establishment of the eternal temple ("4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple," *Hellenica et Judaica*, ed. A. Caquot et al. (Leuven: Peeters, 1986) 165-89. She argues that as long as the "sons of Belial" wield earthly power, Israel's physical temple is desecrated; therefore the "sons of light" will offer up "works of the Torah" (מעשי תורה), rather than burnt offerings, in the "temple of man" (4Q174 fr. 1 1:6-9). Dimant argues that animal sacrifices would not be meant by "works of the Torah" since the sectarian DSS consistently use regular Hebrew terms for animal sacrifice (ibid., 178). Other scholars, including Adela Yarbro Collins, identify the מקדש אדם as the "temple of Adam," the eternal temple

established by YHWH at the End of Days. See eadem, "The Dream of a New Jerusalem at Qumran," *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* vol. 3, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Waco: Baylor, 2006) 231-54.

¹¹ The activity of the *yahad* is limited to the time of the "dominion of Belial": 1QS 1:16-18; 2:19-20; cp. 4:15-26.

¹² Aristotle distinguishes between the *sussitia* of regular citizens and those of state officials, among whom are included the priests of the public cults (*Pol.* 1331a 19-31b 5). Immediately following his note on the requirement for all, including the poor, to furnish a minimum amount themselves, he states that "expenses relating to the gods should be shared in common by the entire *polis*" (*Pol.* 1330a 8-9, tr. Reeve, with modification). We should take this as an indicator that the *sussitia* of the state priests were funded with state monies.

¹³ Soldiers were required to report for duty with rations for three days already packed. This is the norm both in the Greek and Roman evidence. In emergency circumstances, such as when a campaign appeared likely to require extended time in hostile territory, soldiers were required to carry provisions for seventeen days. For surveys of evidence see Pritchett, *Greek State*, 1.32-34; Watson, *Roman Soldier*, 63-65.

Armies in the field were followed by a train of commissioned supply carts that were owned by merchants and staffed by *tamiai*, scribes who recorded each soldier's *purchase* of comestibles. See Pritchett, *Greek State*, 37. Food could also be procured by plunder, from a special expedition sent to resupply troops in the field, by friendly merchants in territories through which armies passed, by allied powers, or by hunting. For full discussion see *ibid.*, 41-49; see also G. Webster, *The Roman Imperial Army* (3d ed.; Totowa: Barnes & Noble, 1985) 262-64.

¹⁴ On the Greek armies esp. W. K. Pritchett's chapter, "Provisioning," in *idem*, *The Greek State at War* (Berkeley: University of California, 1971) 1.30-52. On the Roman armies see G. R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1969) 62-69, 103-4. As Watson states, "rations and arms, unlike clothing, appear never to have been made the subject of a free issue, except in rare instances as a special concession" (104). One of the disciplinary measures that Scipio Africanus imposed upon his soldiers was forbidding them any cooking supplies apart from a bronze skillet and a spit (Appian, *Roman History* 6.14.85, cited in Watson, *Roman Soldier*, 68). For a photo of a Roman soldier's skillet see Watson, 48.

¹⁵ Herodotus gives the earliest evidence for the custom of Spartan military units that shared common meals (*sussitia*) (*Hist.* 1.65.5); he credits Lycurgus for organizing Sparta as a state best suited for war by establishing the *sussitia*, as well as the companies of thirty, the overseers (*ephoroi*), and the elders (*gerousia*). While the historicity of these institutions is still disputed, Sparta's institutions clearly exercised the imaginations of historians and philosophers.

¹⁶ Xen., *Lac. Pol.* 13.1.

¹⁷ Xen., *Lac. Pol.* 15.2-5.